

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

Board Meeting Notes

August 10, 2011, 1:00 p.m.

Questions following Earl Nelson's presentation on the LFR CMP.

Barbara LeVake: We did attend a meeting at the Farm Bureau – how many members of the public have participated in the public outreach?

Earl Nelson: Not sure how many people attended the Board meetings, and how many were specifically interested in our item. However, we had 8 people attend our public workshop at the Farm Bureau.

Barbara LeVake: How is the project being funded?

Earl Nelson: DWR is funding the project, because we believe that a permit process that streamlines our mitigation will save millions of dollars in the long run. General fund and bond money funds this study.

Barbara LeVake: We've had additional conversations after the previous meetings, and I have concerns about the long term funding capability for this project given the overall budget. I think coordination is essential, and that public safety is the number one goal, and I hope that this isn't just a project to revegetate up and down the corridor. We don't necessarily want to see that happen; we've had our own issues with revegetation, and we hope that there will be a good faith effort to work with DFG. While this all sounds great, we need to be very vigilant and watch the process. I appreciate the coordination effort, and if we can get programmatic permits for flood maintenance, that will be great.

Earl Nelson: DWR sees the revegetation efforts as being a part of the process to get programmatic permits from agencies for the work we need to do. It takes time for application and processing, and that has delayed or prevented maintenance in the past. The habitat restoration has to be part of this – regulatory agencies are responsible for oversight and ensuring that habitat is there, and if restoration is not part of the process, the agencies will fight the whole way.

Bill Edgar: Flood risk reduction is our primary objective. If in doing that, we have to mitigate for various environmental impacts, we'll do that, but our primary objective is public safety. We had a good discussion with the department and the members of the LD-1 board. They understand the position of LD-1 that this is a public safety issue, and we expect the department to carry out that objective. But, we don't want to be overrun or subverted by environmental projects that aren't talked about with the maintainers. We came out of that meeting with a good understanding where the department has agreed to look at Abbott Lake, and see if there's a way that they can sit down with DFG and help them understand LD-1 concerns. This will be a HCP for maintenance, and we understand and support that. In return for the support, LD-1 made it known that we want understanding and acknowledgement of the problems that the maintaining agencies have with choking up the river. Conveyance is a big priority. Visibility during flood fighting is an absolute requirement. There's a tension here, and we need to work it out. To implement projects without input from maintaining agencies is not acceptable. We had a good meeting, it happened on Monday, Francis Silva was there.

Barbara LeVake: I would agree – we made progress, and it was a meeting that we should have had sooner rather than later.

Stan Cleveland: I found out about this process in January 2011. This is an important project, especially because it's a pilot program for the state. I started attending, and there were some areas that hadn't been recognized for inclusion into corridor management plan, such as the sediment management and removal. These ideas are now part of the program that were not originally part of the program. It's great to see the changes and shifts that have occurred in the Feather River CMP and players have accepted some things that they would not have accepted before. This Program has lofty goals, but I'm encouraged that everyone is taking part and these goals will be met.